DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 260 164 UD 024 379

TITLE Arts Partners Program. March-June, 1984. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE [84]
NOTE 64p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Agency Cooperation; *Creative Writing; Dance; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Fine Arts; Music; *Poetry; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; School Districts; Teacher Attitudes; Theater Arts; Visual Arts
IDENTIFIERS *Arts Partners Program NY

ABSTRACT

The Arts Partners program, run collaboratively by the New York City Public Schools and other city offices and agencies, was designed to help community school districts initiate or enrich arts education experiences in the basic curriculum. In its pilot phase (from March to June, 1984), the project linked 13 school districts with 13 arts agencies to provide arts programming for 117 schools in all 5 boroughs, serving an estimated 19,000 students. An evaluation of the pilot phase found that, in general, the program operated well. Participants were very pleased with the program, believed that it had a positive impact on students, and wanted it to continue. The program goal of promoting positive student social development by channeling energies into arts activities was successful. Artists established a creative relationship with students in assigned workshop classes and learned about the students' artistic interests. Teachers, in turn, learned about innovative art techniques. The evaluation produced four general recommendations for program enhancement: (1) complete, early planning is crucial to success; (2) to ensure that arts programming is a collaborative effort among districts, awareness about the diversity of arts activities should be increased throughout the districts; (3) each school should appoint a school coordinator to be responsible for implementing the program; and (4) all districts should evaluate their programs with appropriate pre- and posttest measures. (KH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED260164

ARTS PARTNERS PROGRAM

March-June, 1984

OEA Evaluation Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.K. Minter

NYC Bd. of Ed

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

1983-84

ARTS PARTNERS PROGRAM

March-June, 1984

Division of Curriculum
and Instruction
Charlotte Frank
Executive Director

Cultural Arts Unit
Marcia Friedmutter,
Director

Carol Sterling,
Project Coordinator

Prepared by

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPPORT EVALUATION UNIT

Ronald C. Miller, Evaluation Manager
Yvonne Spoerri, Evaluation Consultant

New York City Public Schools
Office of Educational Assessment
Richard Guttenberg, Director
Terry A. Clark, Assistant Director

THE ARTS PARTNERS PROGRAM, SPRING, 1984:
EVALUATION SUMMARY

Arts Partners was a pilot program conceived through a collaborative effort by the Offices of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor, the Department of Cultural Affairs, the Youth Bureau, and the New York City Public Schools. The program is funded jointly by the Youth Bureau and the public schools. It was designed to help community school districts initiate or enrich arts education experiences in the basic curriculum by: 1) drawing on the talents of various artists and the expertise of arts agencies; and 2) providing for the collaboration of arts agency and school staff.

In its pilot phase, the project linked 13 school districts with as many arts agencies to provide arts programming for 117 schools in all five boroughs. The program ran from March to June, 1984, and served an estimated 19,000 students.

The evaluation documented the quality of program implementation and measured the attainment of program objectives. Through interviews, observations, and review of program records.

In general, the Arts Partners Program operated well. Participants were very pleased with the program, believed that it had a positive impact on students, and wanted it to continue. The program goal of promoting positive student social development by channelling energies into arts activities was successful. Artists established a creative relationship with students in assigned workshop classes and learned about the students' artistic interests. Teachers, in turn, learned about innovative art techniques.

The following recommendations are aimed at program enhancement.

- Good, complete planning is crucial to the success of the program. All district liaisons emphasized strongly that planning must begin early in the school year, and that it should involve all program participants, including principals, teachers, and artists.

- In order to ensure that arts programming is a collaborative effort among districts, additional efforts must be made to increase the awareness of school personnel about arts agency activities in other districts.

- A school should demonstrate its commitment to the integration of arts programming into the educational curriculum by assigning a school coordinator, preferably someone with an arts background, who would be responsible for implementing the program.

- All districts should evaluate their programs with appropriate pre- and posttest measures.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
LIST OF TABLES		iv
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Overview	1
	Program Purpose	1
	Program Implementation	5
	The Scope of the Study	6
II.	EVALUATION DESIGN	10
III.	FINDINGS	14
	Observations	14
	Classroom Teachers' Questionnaire	21
	School Administrators' Questionnaire	25
	District Liaisons' Interview	27
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30
	Conclusions	30
	Recommendations	31
APPENDICES		
A.	Arts Agencies Selected by Community School Districts	33
B.	Questionnaire for District Liaison	34
C.	Arts Partners' Questionnaire for Classroom Teachers	41
D.	Arts Partners' Questionnaire for School Administrators	45
E.	Arts Partners' Questionnaire for Cluster Teachers	49
F.	Synopsis of District Programs with Proposed Evaluation Methods and Results	53

LIST OF TABLES

		PAGE
TABLE 1:	Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984, Number and Percentage of Students by Grade in Each District	7
TABLE 2:	Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984, Number and Percentage of Students served by Grade by Services of Arts Agencies	8
TABLE 3:	Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984, Arts Agencies and Districts Selected for Site Visits	11
TABLE 4:	Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984, Number and Percentage of Responses to School Staff Questionnaire in Each District	13
TABLE 5:	Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984, Teachers' Ratings of Student Improvement by Grade Level	22
TABLE 6:	Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984, Ratings of Change in Attitudes and Behavior of Students by Grade	23

I. INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

Arts Partners is a pilot program conceived through a collaborative effort by the Offices of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor, the Department of Cultural Affairs, the Youth Bureau, and the New York City Board of Education. The program is funded jointly by the Youth Bureau and the public schools. It is designed to help community school districts citywide initiate or enrich arts education experiences in the basic curriculum by: (1) drawing on the talents of various artists and the expertise of arts agencies, and (2) providing for the collaboration of arts agency and school staff.

In its pilot phase, the project linked 13 school districts with as many arts agencies to provide arts programming for 117 schools in all five boroughs. The program ran from March to June, 1984, and served an estimated 19,000 students in grades kindergarten through nine.

PROGRAM PURPOSE

Overall Goals

Arts Partners established the following goals:

- To encourage arts organizations to work together, drawing on their combined experiences to develop and implement arts programs in school settings.
- To ensure that city funds spent on arts programming addressed the needs and priorities directly expressed by the schools and communities.

-- To create opportunities for professional artists, teachers, and arts specialists to work collaboratively to improve the delivery of arts services in school settings.

-- To channel the creative energy of inner-city young people into art activities and thereby promote positive social development, as well as to increase children's identification with their own ethnic heritage and their awareness of other cultures.

-- To develop a citywide mechanism for the administration and evaluation of arts services in school settings.

District Program Goals

Based on the overall goals, individual district proposals specified objectives designed to enhance arts programming for their students while creating opportunities for work with specific arts agencies. The 13 districts participating in Art Partners each determined its objectives and methods of assessing their achievement. In some cases, the objectives were diffuse and ambiguous and therefore difficult to assess. The process of selecting districts to participate in the program is described in the next section. Examples of some of these, drawn from different district programs, and based on the use of different media, are listed here:

Music and Dance

-- Pupils will learn how to relate words and syllables to musical notation for rhythm.

-- Pupils will have greater understanding of diverse cultures through learning ethnic dances.

-- Pupils will learn how to cooperate in making music together.

Creative Writing and Poetry

-- Pupils will read works of poets, historians, and novelists in order to improve their basic skills and to gain enrichment in diverse subject areas.

-- Pupils in bilingual classes will improve their proficiency in English through their active participation in the program.

-- Pupils will improve their vocabulary and writing skills by using language for self-expression.

Multimedia/Visual Arts

-- Pupils will discuss and share their accomplishments with each other.

-- Pupils will be exposed to professional artists and learn to experiment in three-dimensional artistic activities.

-- Pupils will engage in murals designed to integrate with the social studies curriculum.

Drama

-- Pupils will engage in workshop activities designed to introduce them to pre-reading, cognitive and conceptual skills, as well as to help them develop self-confidence, group cohesiveness, and positive attitudes toward school and learning.

Site Selection

The Role of the Arts Partners Council. Comprised of the heads of two city agencies and representatives from the Mayor's Office and the Board of Education, the council is the policy making arm of the program, responsible

for defining its major goals and designating district-level participation. In January, 1984, it issued a request for proposals to 32 community school districts; from the 30 responses, 13 districts were chosen to participate.

The number of participating districts was limited by funding. The council was guided in its district selection by some of the following criteria: 1) the district's previous access to arts experiences and current need for arts programming; 2) the clarity of the proposal in identifying goals, objectives, and strategies to meet the district's need; and 3) the degree to which the proposal specified a plan to integrate the arts program into the general curriculum.

A district was expected to demonstrate commitment to the arts by meeting the goals, objectives, and methods outlined in the proposal. In addition, the district was expected to recruit a district liaison to coordinate the local program, as well as to encourage cooperation of participating schools through the provision of flexible scheduling, staff assistance, and necessary space.

The Role of the District Proposal Team. Superintendents designated proposal development teams which generally consisted of a school administrator, an art specialist, curriculum coordinators of bilingual, gifted, or special education programs, and the district superintendents themselves. Each team explored the goals and objectives of its district and then contacted the arts agency which most closely matched its needs. Individual school needs-assessment surveys formed the basis of the proposals, and the proposal team members were not necessarily drawn from the schools subsequently selected for program implementation.

The Role of the Liaison. Usually drawn from the district team, the liaison was responsible for assessing district needs and identifying participating schools once the district had been chosen. At the district level, he or she was to coordinate school activities with the arts agency, insure program implementation, and evaluate program activities. In addition, the liaison participated in monthly meetings with the Arts Partners project director to ensure the achievement of overall program goals through collaboration among districts and between schools and art agencies.

PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Program Development

Each participating district received $12,000 to engage the services of artists from any of 24 arts agencies (see Appendix A) listed in the Guide to Resources provided by the Arts Partners Council . Program development was thus characterized by considerable district autonomy and an intensive relationship between a district and its designated arts agency(ies).

Program Activities

Although activities varied from school to school, programs generally focused on classroom instruction and studio workshops in visual arts, music and dance, creative drama, poetry, scriptwriting, and/or creative writing. District 31 provided an audience-participation, performing-arts assembly-program. All activities were intended to teach students about a specific medium and its practitioners. Some participating districts broadened the arts experiences of these students, while others offered

arts experiences to students for the first time. Depending on the age of the children and the particular medium, students were expected to produce anthologies or exhibitions, and to participate in a district-wide culminating event, which reflected some aspects and products of the program. The activities and products reflected the needs of each particular district.

Student Population

The program served students in kindergarten through eighth grade. Direct service classroom instruction programs were concentrated most heavily at the fourth- through sixth-grade levels, followed by all-day kindergarten. This distribution reflects a perceived need for arts education programming at these two levels, cutting across the full range of district program goals. (See Table 1.)

Art-Agency Participation

The 13 participating agencies provided artists from all areas of the visual, performing, and literary arts. The variety of arts agencies and the media with which they worked indicate the diversity of programming. The agency serving the largest number of students in classroom workshops was The Teachers and Writers Collaborative, followed by the Creative Arts Team and the New York State Poets in the Schools. Lincoln Center Council on Educational Programs and the Staten Island Museum reached the greatest number of students, through audience-participation programs. (See Table 2.)

THE SCOPE OF THE STUDY

This evaluation focuses primarily on the pilot programs developed for classroom instruction, since these are most critical for assessing the

TABLE 1

Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984
Number and Percentage of Students Served by Grade in Each District

District	GRADE LEVEL K N	K (%)	1 - 3 N	1 - 3 (%)	4 - 6 N	4 - 6 (%)	7 - 8 N	7 - 8 (%)	TOTAL N	TOTAL (%)
5	270	(39)	250	(36)	170	(25)	-	-	690	(100)
6	-	-	-	-	70	(35)	130	(65)	200	(100)
7	-	-	90	(17)	450	(83)	-	-	540	(100)
8	-	-	120	(26)	350	(74)	-	-	470	(100)
12	200	(100)	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	(100)
16	430	(100)	-	-	-	-	-	-	430	(100)
19	-	-	300	(100)	-	-	-	-	300	(100)
20	-	-	-	-	790	(100)	-	-	790	(100)
21	-	-	-	-	280	(60)	190	(40)	470	(100)
24	-	-	-	-	240	(100)	-	-	240	(100)
28	450	(100)	-	-	-	-	-	-	450	(100)
29	-	-	-	-	440	(70)	190	(30)	630	(100)
Total N	1350	(25)	760	(14)	2790	(52)	510	(9)	5410	(100)

o District 31 had a total of 13,600 children from all grades. Its program provided school-wide audience participation activities, and therefore was not directly comparable to the programs in the other 12 districts.

TABLE 2

Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984
Number and Percentage of Students by Grade
Served by Arts Agency

Arts Agency	GRADE LEVEL K N	K (%)	1 - 3 N	1 - 3 (%)	4 - 6 N	4 - 6 (%)	7 - 8 N	7 - 8 (%)	TOTAL N	TOTAL (%)
The Asia Society	-	-	-	-	60	(100)	-	-	60	(100)
Bronx Council on the Arts	-	-	-	-	150	(100)	-	-	150	(100)
Brooklyn Arts & Culture Association	-	-	-	-	280	(60)	190	(40)	470	(100)
Children's Art Carnival	-	-	-	-	200	(76)	70	(26)	270	(100)
Creative Arts Team	900	(72)	150	(12)	200	(16)	-	-	1250	(100)
Harlem School of the Arts	-	-	-	-	-	-	60	(100)	60	(100)
Jamaica Arts Center	450	(88)	-	-	60	(12)	-	-	510	(100)
New York Committee for Young Audiences	-	-	-	-	440	(100)	-	-	440	(100)
New York State Poets in the Schools	-	-	150	(25)	270	(45)	180	(30)	600	(100)
Queens Council on the Arts	-	-	-	-	120	(100)	-	-	120	(100)
Teachers & Writers Collaborative	-	-	460	(32)	1010	(68)	-	-	1470	(100)
CLASSROOM WORKSHOP TOTAL	1350	(25)	760	(14)	2790	(52)	510	(9)	5410	(100)
*Lincoln Center Student Program									4600	(100)
*Staten Island Children's Museum									9000	(100)
Audience Participation TOTAL									13,600	(100)
Grand Total									19,010	

*These agencies provided school-wide audience participation activities across all grades. Grade level breakdowns are not included.

goal of incorporating arts programming into the educational curriculum. Chapter II describes the evaluation design, including goals and methods, and Chapter III delineates the findings. Chapter IV is devoted primarily to recommendations focusing especially on the administrative organization, and curricular integration helpful to the continuation and expansion of the Arts Partners Program.

II. EVALUATION DESIGN

In February, 1984, the Office of Educational Assessment was asked by the Division of Curriculum and Instruction and the Youth Bureau to evaluate the Arts Partners pilot program. The evaluation sought to answer the following questions:

- Were the overall central goals of the Arts Partners Program achieved?
- Were each district's goals and objectives achieved? How successful was project implementation in each district?
- Was a satisfactory relationship established between each district and the arts agencies?

In order to determine whether the Arts Partners Program was implemented as proposed, the goals and procedures outlined in the proposal were compared with actual program activities, as assessed through the following techniques: site observations; teachers' and school administrators' questionnaires; teachers', artists', and liaisons' interviews; and a review of program records. The evaluator observed a representative selection of program sites, activities, and culminating events. (See Table 3.)

The evaluator also attended the monthly meetings in which liaisons and representatives of the arts agencies met with the project director to discuss program implementation. Half-hour telephone interviews with 12 liaisons clarified their role and understanding of the project and addressed the evaluation methods that had been undertaken by each district. (See Appendix B.)

Teacher and school administrator questionnaires were distributed to 71 schools in 12 Community School Districts in Queens, Brooklyn, the Bronx, and Manhattan. Since Staten Island's program was not directly comparable to those in the other 12 districts, it was not included in the questionnaire sampling.

TABLE 3

Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984
Arts Agencies and Districts
Selected for Site Visits

Arts Agency	District
Brooklyn Arts and Culture Association	21
Children's Art Carnival	6
Creative Arts Team	5, 16
Harlem School of the Arts	6
Jamaica Arts Center	28
Staten Island Children's Museum	31
New York Committee for Young Audiences	29
New York State Poets in the Schools	6, 19
Queens Council on the Arts	24
Teachers and Writers Collaborative	7, 8

Not observed:
The Asia Society
Bronx Council on the Arts
Lincoln Center Council on Educational Programs

Each of the 180 participating classroom teachers, the school administrators, and the cluster teachers in the 71 schools received questionnaires. (See Appendices C, D, and E.) Considering the relatively brief and late period the Arts Partners Program operated, the response rates of teachers and administrators were impressive. The low response rate of the cluster teachers is also noteworthy, indicating that there were few art specialists who played a coordinating role in the program. (See Table 4.)

TABLE 4

Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984
Number and Percentage of Responses
to School Staff Questionnaires in Each District

District	Teachers		School Administrators		Cluster Teachers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%*
5	8	40.0	-	-	-	
6	2	28.6	-	-	-	
7	10	58.9	4	66.7	1	
8	13	92.9	5	100.0	-	
12	7	87.5	4	50.0	-	
16	10	62.5	5	62.5	-	
19	11	91.7	2	66.7	-	
20	21	72.4	5	62.5	3	
21	12	85.7	6	85.7	4	
24	7	85.7	3	75.0	4	
28	12	75.0	4	80.0	-	
29	11	61.1	5	71.4	1	
Total	124	68.9	41	57.7	13	

*Not available

III. FINDINGS

This chapter reports evaluation findings concerning program implementation and efficacy in the 13 participating districts. Information collected during site visits is reported first. Each site visit consisted of classroom observations and interviews with participating artists, teachers, and school administrators. Results of analyses of questionnaires administered to classroom teachers and school administrators are presented next. Finally, the chapter describes findings from interviews conducted with district liaisons.

OBSERVATIONS

The classroom observations focused on several aspects of instruction, including arts activities, student-artist interaction, teacher-artist interaction and student behavior. The purpose of these observations was to ascertain the dynamics of the program and to gain a sense of the impact of the Arts Partners Program on the schools.

In all classes observed, students eagerly participated. Excellent rapport was established between artists and students; in many cases the children appeared to regret the departure of the artists at the end of a class period. Teachers, who often worked in teams with artists and other district personnel, reported positive feelings toward the artists.

Culminating events, observed in six districts, appeared to upgrade participating students' self-esteem. These events consisted of poetry recitals, poetry anthologies, dance festivals, student fairs, music performances, art works, murals, art exhibits, and video-tapes. Parent

awareness of the program was promoted by inviting parents to culminating activities. Although parents were invited in all districts, only two of the six observed events were well attended by parents. Poor attendance may be attributed to limited planning time, rather than lack of parental interest.

Many districts viewed these culminating Arts Partners events as their main goal; they felt that poetry recitals, dance festivals, and exhibitions, etc. were tangible measures of pupils' self-esteem, teachers' enthusiasm, and parents' responsiveness. Other districts emphasized workshop activities rather than finished products. Drama activities, including role playing and improvisation, were used to develop vocabulary skills, enrich self-image and enhance cultural awareness. Photographs of these activities were displayed at the districts' annual childhood fairs.

The following anecdotes are examples of site observations presented according to art form. The community school district (C.S.D.), participating art agency, and specific art form are noted at the beginning of each observation.

Visual Arts

Community School District 6, Children's Art Carnival: Printing

The 14 at-risk students in this printing workshop became increasingly engaged by the process of transferring designs onto sheets of linoleum. Each time an individual student began to print, the other students grew extremely excited and were highly motivated to complete their own projects.

Community School District 21, Brooklyn Arts and Culture Association: Sculpting

The visiting artist showed a group of 30 students a wood relief, and then asked each student to draw an original design on a piece of wood. The students shared their designs with the artist, the teacher, and with each other; in addition, they helped one another with problems. The final designs portrayed the students' varied cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

Community School District 28, Jamaica Arts Center: Dance, Puppetry, Mask making, Ceramics, Photography

During one afternoon, the students participated in a series of arts activities:

Dance. In the first class, students were shown by a visiting dancer how to imitate the movements of various animals. Then, the students and the dancer together pantomimed different activities and emotions, such as laughter, sleep, and anger. The students, who viewed themselves in large mirrors on the wall, were extremely expressive.

Mask making. The students shaped clay over oval-shaped pieces of newspaper in order to create original masks; they invented a wide variety of features and expressions.

Photography. the students developed their own photographs; they easily grasped the entire process.

At the end of the afternoon, the five classes met to share their accomplishments. The students spontaneously hugged the artists good-bye.

Music and Dance

Community School District 29, New York Committee for Young Audiences: Music

Two visiting musicians instructed a group of 32 students in how to make their own musical instruments with tools such as saws, hammers, and nails. After the students had constructed their instruments, they painted them. They eagerly assisted one another in these tasks so that they could begin to practice together for the musical performance scheduled for their final session.

Community School District 31, Staten Island Children's Museum: Dance

On stage at a school in Staten Island, Clive Thompson described to approximately 800 students the history of his dance group and the influence of Martha Graham. Six dancers then performed; throughout their performance, Mr. Thompson discussed their technique, as well as the meaning and purpose of dance as an art form.

Community School District 7, Teachers and Writers Collaborative: Dance

The visiting artist explained to the students how their parents could make simple costumes for their dance performance. The students enthusiastically suggested ideas for costumes. After the class was finished, one student returned to show the artist his original design for a costume.

Community School District 24, Queens Council on the Arts: Dance

Hundreds of parents came to watch the students' Annual Dance Festival; the schoolyard was festively decorated and the students were dressed in costumes of their own design. The festivities climaxed in a traditional May-pole dance.

Community School District 16, Creative Arts Team: Drama

Two visiting actors engaged a group of 14 kindergarten students in a drama workshop. The students pretended to enter a real theatre, where they watched the actors perform a skit called "The Berry Hunt." The students grew so involved that they mimed eating the imaginary berries.

Poetry and Creative Writing

Community School District 7, Teachers and Writers Collaborative: Creative Writing

The visiting writer described to the enthusiastic students her own love of Oreo cookies and her problem of neatly breaking the cookies apart in order to first eat the fillling; then she told them about her idea for the "Perfect-Oreo-Even-Up-Machine." The students were inspired by both her problem and her invention to write about similar problems and inventions of their own.

Community School District 8, Teachers and Writers Collaborative: Creative Writing

The visiting artist helped the students draw maps of imaginary lands. One student drew a "Dum-Dum-Land" with "Crazy Woods" and "Idiot Trees." Many students drew maps with divorce as the central image. Other maps were of "Baseball-Land," "Michael Jackson-Land," and "Video-Land."

INTERVIEWS

Many teachers expressed satisfaction in being able to work collaboratively with participating artists. One language arts teacher commented

that although she had been involved in many funded arts programs in her 25 years of service, she had never enjoyed a program so much. Being part of the program planning in her district also made her feel that she was an integral part of the Arts Partners Program.

Teachers and artists alike commented on the organizational problems that arose occasionally. Some art materials were not delivered on time; some arts agencies unexpectedly rescheduled artists; and some school administrators neglected to designate a specific classroom for the incoming artist. However, teachers did not perceive these as major problems, but as obstacles that would be solved if the program operated for a longer period, and if each school and district had adequate time to prepare for implementation.

The following examples represent typical responses by participating artists and teachers to implementation of the program.

> A classroom teacher had not expected the students to concentrate so well in this dance class. Both their performance abilities and their interest in mastering complex and sophisticated dances far exceeded her expectations. The students spontaneously planned a rehearsal after school.

> A visiting dancer stated that the participating classroom teachers were exceptionally responsive to her dance workshop. She was particularly pleased when one teacher helped her to buy fabric for the students' costumes, and when another enthusiastically invented an original "Aztec" dance and danced along with the students. The dancer believed that the excellent cooperation of teachers and the principal was very beneficial to the project.

> A visiting writer who had no previous experience working with small children very much enjoyed this new experience. She did complain, however, about not being assigned regularly to one classroom, as well as about the lack of necessary materials, such as paper. She also noted that the difficulty in arranging for an unoccupied classrom often made it difficult for her to conduct her workshop correctly.

A classroom teacher had been initially skeptical about the sculpting project and had felt that it was being imposed upon her; she changed her mind, however, when she saw its successful implementation. She added that she and the visiting sculptor frequently met for consultations, and that the students were extremely fond of the sculptor.

The director of a participating arts agency was so pleased with the program that he is now going to add kindergarten workshops to his agency's own summer workshop offerings. He felt that the orientation sessions preceding the workshops helped the classroom teachers to understand program objectives and therefore to more effectively prepare the students for the workshop. He added that coordination between the district and his agency was excellent.

A visiting writer complimented the school for being supportive; she noted that the three participating teachers, in particular, were quite enthusiastic and cooperative. She also provided a progress report on her workshop to the O.E.A. evaluator.

A participating principal gave the visiting artist carte blanche to conduct her workshop as she wanted to; he was so pleased with her performance that he wrote a letter to the participating arts agency expressing his great satisfaction both with the agency and with the artist.

A classroom teacher explained that at-risk students are reluctant to make any commitment to school activities, and are constantly on the verge of becoming dropouts. Therefore, he was deeply impressed by how many of these students attended the visiting artist's printing workshop. He felt that the students were motivated to learn printing because they perceived it as a tangible skill. He expressed his hope that the Arts Partners Program would be continued.

A participating arts agency had a well-organized system of orientation and evaluation. In this particular instance, the two visiting actors from the agency filled out an evaluation form together following their drama workshop. Then they asked the classroom teacher for her evaluation. She felt that the orientation session preceding the workshop had enabled her to better understand the project as well as to feel that her participation was desired. The district had provided substitute teachers so that participating teachers could leave their classrooms to attend these orientation sessions.

A classroom teacher stated that her students very much looked forward to the visiting artist's workshop; she noted that they were excited by the artist's creative approach to teaching. She added that she and the artist met frequently and had established a positive working relationship.

CLASSROOM TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Topics on the questionnaire were designed to assess the perceived effects of the program, such as children's changes in classroom behavior, academic skills, and attitudes toward arts activities. In addition, information was gathered regarding the teachers' views of the program's implementation and its success in meeting district and overall program goals.

Student Improvement

Overall, the teachers' ratings reflected the positive impact of programming on students, and, therefore, the success of important program objectives. Teachers reported that attendance increased, and their classroom behavior showed moderate improvement. Similarly, teachers indicated that the program had been somewhat successful in improving students' academic motivation and self-esteem.

In regard to the program's goals for cognitive skills development and subject content, teachers reported that, although the program had been successful in teaching about diverse cultures, it had little effect in improving students' academic skills in writing, math, and reading. About a third of the teachers suggested that the program had no real bearing on these areas, even if such skills had been specified as program objectives. The brevity of the program clearly limits its potential impact; however, given long-term in the program, these improvements might have a cumulative positive effect on students' academic achievement. (See Table 5.)

TABLE 5

Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984
Teachers' Ratings of Student Improvement by Grade Level*
(N = 124)

	GRADE LEVEL				
	K	1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	TOTAL
Improvement in:	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
Arts skills	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.5	1.6
Awareness of Culture and Artists	1.7	1.8	1.7	1.8	1.7
Academic Motivation and Classroom Behavior	1.8	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.8
Self-esteem	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.3	1.5
Academic skills	2.1	1.8	2.2	2.3	2.1
Attendance	1.9	2.0	1.8	1.4	1.8

*Student improvement was rated for each item according to the following scale.

1 = Very successful
2 = Moderately successful
3 = Moderately unsuccessful
4 = Not at all successful

o Teachers ratings of each item were incorporated only when an item reflected a districts's program.

TABLE 6

Arts Partners Program, Spring, 1984
Ratings of Change in Attitudes and Behavior
of Students by Grade*
(N = 124)

	GRADE LEVEL				
	K	1 - 3	4 - 6	7 - 9	TOTAL
Improvement in:	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN	MEAN
Children demonstrated greater creative expression	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.7
Children became more aware of pursuing a career in the arts	2.6	2.0	2.5	2.4	2.4
Children got along better together	2.0	1.9	2.0	1.4	2.0
Children expressed an interest in becoming more involved in the art form	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.2	1.8
Children became more aware of positive role models	1.8	1.6	1.9	1.6	1.8

*Student improvement was rated for each item according to the following scale.

1 = A great deal
2 = Moderately
3 = Slightly
4 = Not at all

o Teachers ratings of each item were incorporated only when an item reflected a districts's program.

Asked to rate students' changes in attitudes and behavior, teachers reported the following: all students showed at least moderately greater artistic expressiveness; a majority of the students appeared interested in becoming more involved in the art form in which they worked; and the artists served as positive role models. Interest in greater involvement with art forms was significantly higher for the seventh- to eighth-grade group, although there was not the accompanying change in career orientation that might have been expected at these higher grade levels. In addition, members of this older group improved relations with other students. Since a large number of participating students in this category are at risk, this particular improvement speaks well for the program's success in promoting students' positive social behavior. (See Table 6.)

Program Implementation

Teacher responses to program implementation showed that teachers considered the program activities to be appropriate for their students. The teachers enjoyed the successful working relationships they had developed with the artists. They perceived inaccurately that planning for the program was neither their responsibility, nor the school's responsibility.

Eighty seven percent thought the Arts Partners Program had been effectively carried out at their school, while still more believed these programs to be appropriate for their students' grade levels. They enthusiastically reported the artists' success in establishing rapport and communicating with the students -- both confirmed by the evaluator's observations. Yet three quarters of the teachers indicated that the arts

agencies, rather than the classroom teacher, the cluster teacher, or the school administrator, had been responsible for the daily program planning. When asked whether program objectives had been achieved, half of the teachers agreed that these were successful; some could not comment because they did not know. Forty-five percent indicated that they had either limited or no input into planning. Teachers that provided extensive input for the development of the Arts Partners Program before it began believed that the program's objectives had been met more successfully than teachers who had moderate, limited, or no input. As a result, 28 percent requested more orientation sessions and 51 percent requested more meeting and planning time for future programs.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Topics to which school administrators responded included: site selection; presence and involvement of full-time arts teachers, administrators, and parents; student demographic characteristics and achievement levels; and the success of the Arts Partners Program in achieving its objectives.

A majority of the schools had been selected by the district superintendent, with some chosen by the district liaison; only five percent were participating at the schools' request. Once a site had been selected, school administrators usually chose the participating class.

When asked why their school had been selected, about half thought that students met selection criteria, and a third attributed it to the school staff's interest. Seventy percent believed they were chosen because the school had limited exposure to the type of art provided by the art agency

for their district. Only 20% thought they were chosen because the school had limited exposure to arts experiences.

A variety of issues emerged regarding the responsibilities of the various participants in planning and implementing the program. Few administrators participated in program planning, with close to 50 percent having little or no involvement, and a great majority of these administrators believed that the arts agencies were responsible for daily planning. Only a third of the administrators felt that such daily planning was their responsibility. A third also reported having a full-time non-program arts teacher on staff, but only 15 percent of these teachers had participated in the program. In addition, ten percent of the administrators felt that cluster teachers were responsible for daily planning, yet only two and a half percent reported having had a cluster teacher participating in the program. This inconsistency maybe attributed to random error which occurred in responding to the questionnaire. Despite this confusion about responsibilities, however, 67 percent felt that they had understood the program objectives and 87 percent considered that the program had been well-implemented.

When asked to assess parental and teacher response, half the administrators indicated that they had invited parents to attend special events and that those participating had responded favorably. Most responding teachers were enthusiastic, however administrators rated 15 percent of the teachers as only moderately interested.

Generally the program involved mainstream youngsters in the average range of abilities. More than half of the administrators reported that each participating class had at least one child with limited English pro-

ficiency. In assessing the program's impact on the students, administrators tended to rate improvement more highly -- and probably less accurately -- than their teachers had. Both administrators and teachers concurred that the effect on academic performance -- rather than on affective and artistic domains -- was only moderate.

Eighty-one percent felt that the Arts Partners Program in their district had been successful in achieving its objectives; many suggested that the program be extended and expanded.

DISTRICT LIAISONS' INTERVIEW

During telephone interviews conducted with each of the 13 liaisons, many subjects were discussed by the liaison and the evaluator from O.E.A., including the selection method by which the liaison had been chosen, the liaison's previous experience with arts projects, and the amount of time the liaison had devoted to the program. Also discussed were the objectives of the liaison's district, the selection method for arts agencies, and the amount of participation by the arts agencies, the teachers, and the school administrators. Finally, the liaison and the evaluator discussed the evaluation procedure and the results of the evaluation in each district. This section covers the major responses to these subjects.

In order to identify specific needs and objectives in the district, the liaison generally sent out needs assessment surveys to the schools, responded to the schools' interest, and chose schools based on the following criteria: the need for art education, ethnic composition, and the number of non-English speaking or bilingual students who would most benefit from arts programs.

The selection of the arts agency was based on the liaison's previous experience with a particular arts agency, and specifically on its ability to meet the districts' current needs. (Eight of the districts had had previous experience, five had not.)

All liaisons felt that the districts had taken full advantage of the services offered by the arts agencies. A few liaisons did recommend, however, that the bilingual poetry workshops emphasize the diversity among Hispanic cultures in addition to using Spanish language, and that the arts agencies standardize their fees.

All the liaisons expressed general satisfaction with their respective arts agencies. Eleven of the thirteen district liaisons said that the project required more time than expected and attributed this to the extent of follow-up work. The liaisons recommended an expansion of the program to a larger number of schools, and indicated that more time needed to be given to orientation than had been done in the pilot phase.

Each of the district liaisons felt that their district had met its goals and objectives. Evidence from teacher questionnaires and site observations indicated that district goals were more likely to be met when they were concise and targeted at students who had been deliberately selected for the program, such as bilingual, career-oriented, or at-risk students. In districts where schools and target populations were not chosen systematically, the goals were harder to define and therefore more difficult to evaluate.

In sum, O.E.A. reviewed three sources of evaluation material: 1) the evaluation methods as proposed by each district according to the original proposals; 2) the evaluation methods that were reported by each district liaison at time of telephone interview; and 3) the evaluation results that districts submitted to O.E.A. or the program director. (See Appendix F.) Some arts agencies submitted culminating material at the end of the program. In reviewing these three sources it seems that some objectives were too diffuse, overstated and/or too remote for the arts projects, given their short-term nature; e.g., integration into the content curriculum. Other objectives did not specify appropriate criteria of program effectiveness.

All liaisons claimed that the goals and objectives outlined in their proposals had been met, though their evidence was occasionally impressionistic. Most districts had employed some evaluation methods of their own to determine program success. Many liaisons felt, however, that the pre- and posttests they had used were not valid because of the short duration of the program. Several districts had also used self-esteem tests. In general, though, the liaisons believed that the students' artistic products (performances, poetry anthologies, poetry recitals, art exhibits, etc.) and the verbal responses from participating school staff and parents were better measures of program success.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

In general, the Arts Partners Program was well implemented, despite its brief duration. Participants believed that the program had a positive impact on students and they would strongly like to see it continued. The program goal of promoting positive student social development by channelling creative energies into arts activities was successfully met; however, the goal of systematically integrating arts activities into the content curricula was not met because of the brief duration of the program.

School administrators, district liaisons, artists, and teachers connected with the Arts Partners Program were nearly unanimous in their enthusiasm about the value of the program for New York City students. All students -- whether in all-day kindergarten, or in bilingual, gifted and talented, or dropout-prevention programs -- showed a keen interest in participating in the different creative arts media. Observations of program activities revealed that special education students flourished among their peers; at-risk students created murals out of break dancing and graffiti-writing; and gifted and talented students expanded their achievements into untapped creative fields. When predetermined district-planned activities did not fit students's needs or interests, teachers and artists were able to modify activities as warranted by the specific class. Artists established a creative relationship with students; students developed greater interest in the arts; and teachers learned innovative arts techniques.

As a pilot, the Arts Partners Program suffered from narrow time constraints. Consequently, problems arose in allocating responsibilities

for program implementation. In some cases district liaisons, who had numerous other responsibilities, could not devote the attention necessary to ensure comprehensive implementation in each school. Principals and teachers, who were responsible for implementation, were not always involved in project planning and therefore had limited knowledge of the value of the arts program. In some schools where there was inadequate coordination, appropriate evaluation measures could not be employed, and sometimes communication between the school staff and the arts agency personnel was difficult to achieve.

In conclusion, despite problems imposed by time constraints, the three-month pilot implementation of the Arts Partners Program represented a positive experience in most districts. Students improved in several areas, particularly in self-esteem, arts skills, awareness of professional artists, and academic motivation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are offered for the further enhancement of program implementation and student gains:

- encourage early program planning that includes all participants;
- expand efforts to provide staff-development activities, such as a district-wide orientation session for teachers and artists prior to the implementation of the program;
- after the schools have been selected, convene a citywide orientation for principals emphasizing the value of integrating the arts into the school curriculum;
- promote increased collaboration among the district liaisons, the arts agencies, the visiting artists, and the school staff, perhaps by increasing awareness about the diversity of arts activities throughout the districts;

- encourage principals to assign a school coordinator who would be responsible for the daily planning and implementation of the program; and

- expand efforts to standardize and extend district evaluation activities.

APPENDIX A

Arts Agencies Selected by Community School Districts

Community School District 5:	Creative Arts Team
	Teachers and Writers Collaborative
Community School District 6:	Harlem School of the Arts
	Children's Art Carnival
	New York State Poets in the Schools
Community School District 7:	Teachers and Writers Collaborative
Community School District 8:	Bronx Council on the Arts
	Teachers and Writers Collaborative
	Children's Art Carnival
Community School District 12:	Creative Arts Team
Community School District 16:	Creative Arts Team
Community School District 19:	Creative Arts Team
	New York State Poets in the Schools
Community School District 20:	Creative Arts Team
	New York State Poets in the Schools
	Teachers and Writers Collaborative
Community School District 21:	Brooklyn Arts and Culture Association
Community School District 24:	The Asia Society
	Queens Council on the Arts
	Jamaica Arts Center
Community School District 28:	Jamaica Arts Center
Community School District 29:	New York Committee for Young Audiences
	New York State Poets in the Schools
Community School District 31:	Staten Island Children's Museum
	Lincoln Center Council on Educational Programs

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT: _____ TITLE: _____

NAME: _____

List the arts agencies and the respective programs in the district:

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____

1. What is your position in this District?

2. Who selected you to coordinate the Arts Partners Project? Why?

3. Have you previously been involved in other arts program? Have there been any other arts projects with outside arts agencies in your district, prior to this one?

3a. To what extent have you been involved in this Arts Partners Program?

4. To what extent were you involved in the writing of the original proposal?

5. On what basis did you identify district needs and objectives?

6. How were the participating schools identified?

7. How were the participating students identified?

8. Why did you choose the particular Arts Agencies in your district?

9. Did you have any previous experience with this/these Arts Agencie(s)?

10. If there were more than one Arts Agency in your district, were they aware of each other's presence and programs so as to increase the likelihood of coordination and mutual support?

11. Were you completely informed about each Arts Agency's expertise?

12. In your opinion, did you take full advantage of their expertise?

13. Do you feel the Arts Agencies lived up to what they had promised?

14. Were any of the participating teachers and school administrators asked to be involved in the planning sessions for the Arts Partners Program?

15. Do you think they should be participating in the early stages of the proposal writing?

If yes, please explain.

If no, please explain.

16. Did any orientation sessions take place prior to the program? If so, between whom?

17. Were you able to schedule this Project into your regular daily activities? Did you have enough time to coordinate this project correctly?

18. Did this Project require more time than expected? _____
If so, what caused this?

19. Were any provisions taken to assist you in any excess Arts Partners-related work?

20. What specific evaluation activities were undertaken by either you or the school staff? e.g., Specifically developed tests for programs? (pre- or post-tests), performances, products and other culminating events? [go over with their objectives listed in their proposals were these evaluated/measured? how?]

21. Were these types of evaluation methods effective in measuring the goals?

22. How complete have the results been?

23. What were the actual results in your districts?
PLEASE INCLUDE COPIES OF TESTS OR ANY OTHER RESULTS

24. Were these objectives met in your district?

25. What conclusions do you draw from all the results you have collected at the end of this Project?

26. Have you decided to change any of the following participants if the Program will be continued?

1. Target population?

2. Schools?

3. Arts Agencies?

27. In your opinion, what were the goals of this Arts-Partnership?

28. Do you have any suggestions to improve future implementation of the Arts Partners Program? Please list them:

Any other comments:

ARTS PARTNERS' QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS

Community School District _____ School _____

Grade Level _____ Class Size _____

List the Arts Agency and its Program: _____

---

1. How many times a week has your class participated in the Arts Partners Program?

   _____days/week

2. How many weeks has your program operated?

   _____weeks

3. How many minutes did each session last?

   _____minutes/session

4. How would you classify your pupils' academic achievement level? (check one)

   _____ 1. gifted and talented
   _____ 2. mainstream - above average
   _____ 3. mainstream - average
   _____ 4. mainstream - below average
   _____ 5. Special Education

5. How many Special Education pupils participated in the class program? (check one)

   _____ 1. none
   _____ 2. 1-5
   _____ 3. 6-10
   _____ 4. more than 10

6. How many Limited English Proficient pupils participated in the program? (Check one)

   _____ 1. none
   _____ 2. 1-5
   _____ 3. 6-10
   _____ 4. more than 10

7. Has only part of your class participated in the Arts Partners Program? (check one)

   _____ 1. Yes, only part of the class has participated.
   _____ 2. No, the entire class participated.

   7a. If yes, explain. _____

_____

_____

8. To what degree did you provide for the development of your Arts Partners Program before it began? (check one)

_____ 1. extensive
_____ 2. moderate
_____ 3. limited
_____ 4. none at all

9. Who were/was most responsible for daily planning of the Arts Partners Program in your school? (check as many as appropriate)

_____ 1. school administrator
_____ 2. the district liaison
_____ 3. arts agency personnel
_____ 4. the cluster/art teacher
_____ 5. classroom teachers

10. How would you describe the implementation of the Arts Partners Program? (check one)

_____ 1. Very well implemented
_____ 2. Well implemented
_____ 3. Adequately implemented
_____ 4. It was poorly implemented

11. How would you judge the level of difficulty of the arts curriculum for participants? (check one)

_____ 1. It was too difficult.
_____ 2. It was on the appropriate level.
_____ 3. It was too easy.

12. Has your Arts Partners activity met regularly as scheduled? (check one)

_____ 1. yes
_____ 2. no

12a. If no, please explain:_____

_____

13. How well have artists established rapport with pupils? (check one)

_____ 1. very well
_____ 2. well
_____ 3. adequately
_____ 4. poorly

14. How well have artists been communicating with pupils? (check one)

_____ 1. very well
_____ 2. well
_____ 3. adequately
_____ 4. poorly

15. To what degree were children interested in the Arts Partners arts activities? (check one)

____ 1. extensively
____ 2. moderately
____ 3. to a limited extent
____ 4. not at all

16. Please rate the success of the Art Partners Program in enabling participating children to improve. (Place a check on the scale next to each item).

	1 Very successful	2 Moderately successful	3 Moderately unsuccessful	4 Not at all successful
Children improved in:				
a. Arts skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Awareness of professional artists	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Academic motivation	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Self-esteem	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Classroom behavior	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Writing skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Reading skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Math skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Attendance	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Knowledge of diverse cultures	_____	_____	_____	_____
k. other (please specify)				
_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

17. Please rate the extent to which children's attitudes and behavior changed As a result of the program. (Place a check on the scale next to each item).

	A great deal	Moderately	Slightly	Not at All
a. Children demonstrated greater creative expression.	___	___	___	___
b. Children became more aware of pursuing a career in the arts.	___	___	___	___
c. Children got along better together.	___	___	___	___

d. Children expressed an interest in becoming more involved in the art form. ___ ___ ___ ___

e. Children became more aware of positive role models. ___ ___ ___ ___

f. Other (please specify):_____ ___ ___ ___ ___

18. A goal of this program was to encourage a partnership in arts education between the school and the arts agency.
To what degree was this goal achieved? (check one)

_____ 1. very successful
_____ 2. moderately successful
_____ 3. moderately unsuccessful
_____ 4. not at all successful

19. The best possible way to improve this partnership would be: (check one)

_____ 1. to have more orientation for teachers prior to the program.
_____ 2. to allow more opportunity for teachers and artists to meet for evaluating and planning on an ongoing basis.
_____ 3. to provide more teacher input in planning and implementation of the program earlier in the proposal writing stage.
_____ 4. other. (please specify) _____

_____

20. If you wish to recount a "Success Story", please let us know how a participant benefitted from Art Partners. (optional)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ARTS PARTNERS' QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

Community School District _____ School _____

Position _____

List the arts agency(ies) and the respective programs in your school:

_____

_____

1. Check the grade level of all participating classes. (Check as many as appropriate.):

K ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___
5 ___ 6 ___ 7 ___ 8 ___ 9 ___

2. How many classes in your school are participating in the Arts Partners Program?

_____ classes

3. How many times a week has each class participated in the Arts Partners Program?

_____ times/week

4. How many weeks will your program operate?

_____ weeks

5. How many minutes has each session lasted?

_____ minutes

6. How would you classify pupils' academic achievement level? (Check one.)

_____ 1. gifted and talented
_____ 2. mainstream - above average
_____ 3. mainstream - average
_____ 4. mainstream - below average
_____ 5. special education
_____ 6. heterogeneous

7. How many special education students are in Arts Partners classes? (Check one.)

_____ 1. none
_____ 2. 1-20
_____ 3. 21-40
_____ 4. more than 40

8. How many limited English proficient students are in the Arts Partners classes? (Check one.)

_____ 1. none
_____ 2. 1-20
_____ 3. 21-40
_____ 4. more than 40

9. Is there a full-time art teacher in your school? (Check one.)

_____ 1. yes
_____ 2. no

9a. If yes, is he/she involved in the program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. yes
_____ 2. no

10. How was your school selected for participation in the Arts Partners Program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. through the district superintendent
_____ 2. at my request, as principal or assistant principal
_____ 3. at the request of the Arts Partners district liaison
_____ 4. other (please specify): _____

11. Why was your school selected to participate? (Check one.)

_____ 1. school staff interest in the arts
_____ 2. extensive staff experience in the arts
_____ 3. limited staff experience in the arts
_____ 4. students met district selection criteria for program
_____ 5. Other (please specify): _____

12. Who selected participating classes? (Check one.)

_____ 1. school administrator
_____ 2. art/cluster teachers
_____ 3. classroom teachers
_____ 4. other (please specify): _____

13. How would you rate your school's general involvement with arts? (Check one.)

_____ 1. extensive
_____ 2. moderate
_____ 3. limited

14. How would you rate your school's previous involvement with the art form provided by the Arts Partners Program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. extensive
_____ 2. moderate
_____ 3. limited

15. To what degree did you provide input for the development of your Arts Partners Program before it began? (Check one.)

_____ 1. extensive
_____ 2. moderate
_____ 3. limited
_____ 4. none at all

16. Before implementation of the Arts Partners Program, its objectives were: (Check one.)

_____ 1. fully understood
_____ 2. partly understood
_____ 3. not at all understood

17. How would you describe the implementation of the Arts Partners Program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. very well implemented
_____ 2. well implemented
_____ 3. adequately implemented
_____ 4. poorly implemented

18. Who was responsible for daily planning of the Arts Partners Program? (Check as many as are appropriate.)

_____ 1. school administrator
_____ 2. district liaison
_____ 3. arts agency personnel
_____ 4. cluster/art teacher
_____ 5. classroom teachers

19, Were parents invited to participate in the Arts Partners Program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. yes
_____ 2. no

19a. If yes, what were parents' responses to the Arts Partners Program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. enthusiastic
_____ 2. moderately interested
_____ 3. not very interested
_____ 4. no feedback from parents

20. How would you rate teachers' responses to having the program in their classrooms? (Check one.)

_____ 1. enthusiastic
_____ 2. moderately interested
_____ 3. not very interested
_____ 4. no feedback from teachers

21. Please rate the success of the Art Partners Program in enabling participating children to improve. (Place a check on the scale next to each item.)

	1 Very successful	2 Moderately successful	3 Moderately unsuccessful	4 Not at all successful
Children improved in:				
a. Arts skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Awareness of professional artists	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Academic motivation	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Self-esteem	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Classroom behavior	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Writing skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Reading skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Math skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Attendance	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Knowledge of diverse cultures	_____	_____	_____	_____

22. To what degree was the Arts Partners Program successful in achieving its objectives? (Check one.)

_____ 1. very successful
_____ 2. moderately successful
_____ 3. moderately unsuccessful
_____ 4. not at all successful

23. Suggestions for future program implementation _____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

ARTS PARTNERS' QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLUSTER TEACHERS

Community School District _____ School _____

Position _____

List the Arts Agency(ies) and the respective programs in your school:

_____

_____

1. Check the grade level of all participating classes (Check as many as appropriate):

   K ___ 1 ___ 2 ___ 3 ___ 4 ___
   5 ___ 6 ___ 7 ___ 8 ___ 9 ___

2. How many classes in the school are participating in the Arts Partners Program?

   _____ classes

3. How many times a week did each class participate in the Arts Partners Program?

   _____ times/week

4. How many weeks did your program operate?

   _____ weeks

5. How many minutes did each session last?

   _____ minutes

6. How would you classify pupils' academic achievement level? (Check one.)

   _____ 1. gifted and talented
   _____ 2. mainstream - above average
   _____ 3. mainstream - average
   _____ 4. mainstream - below average
   _____ 5. special education
   _____ 6. heterogeneous

7. How many special education students are in Arts Partners Classes? (Check one.)

   _____ 1. none
   _____ 2. 1-20
   _____ 3. 21-40
   _____ 4. more than 40

8. How many limited English proficient students are in the Arts Partners Program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. none

_____ 2. 1-20

_____ 3. 21-40

_____ 4. more than 40

9. Have Arts Partners activities met regularly as scheduled? (Check one.)

_____ 1. yes
_____ 2. no

9a. If no, please explain:_____

_____

10. To what degree did you provide input for the development of the Arts Partners program before it began? (Check one.)

_____ 1. extensive
_____ 2. moderate
_____ 3. limited
_____ 4. none at all

11. Who were/was most responsible for <u>daily</u> planning of the Arts Partners Program? (Check as many as appropriate.)

_____ 1. school administrator
_____ 2. district liaison
_____ 3. arts agency personnel
_____ 4. cluster/art teacher
_____ 5. classroom teachers

12. How would you describe the implementation of the Arts Partners Program? (Check one.)

_____ 1. very well implemented
_____ 2. well implemented
_____ 3. adequately implemented
_____ 4. poorly implemented

13. How would you judge the level of difficulty of the arts curriculum for participants? (Check one.)

_____ 1. It was too difficult.
_____ 2. It was on the appropriate level.
_____ 3. It was too easy.

14. How well have artists been communicating with pupils? (Check one.)

_____ 1. very well
_____ 2. well
_____ 3. adequately
_____ 4. poorly

14A. How well have artists established rapport with pupils? (Check one.)

_____ 1. very well
_____ 2. well
_____ 3. adequately
_____ 4. poorly

15. How would you rate childrens' interest in Arts Partners arts activities? (Check one.)

_____ 1. extensive
_____ 2. moderate
_____ 3. limited
_____ 4. none

16. Please rate the success of the Art Partners Program in enabling participating children to improve. (Place a check on the scale next to each item.)

	1 Very successful	2 Moderately successful	3 Moderately unsuccessful	4 Not at all successful
Children improved in:				
a. Arts skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Awareness of professional artists	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Academic motivation	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Self-esteem	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Classroom behavior	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Writing skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Reading skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Math skills	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Attendance	_____	_____	_____	_____
j. Knowledge of diverse cultures	_____	_____	_____	_____
k. Other (please specify): _____	_____	_____	_____	_____

17. Please rate the extent to which children's attitudes and behavior changed as a result of the program. (Place a check on the scale next to each item.)

	A Great Deal	Mod-erately	Slightly	Not At All
a. Children demonstrated greater creative expression.	___	___	___	___
b. Children became more aware of pursuing a career in the arts.	___	___	___	___
c. Children got along better together.	___	___	___	___
d. Children expressed an interest in becoming more involved in the art form.	___	___	___	___
e. Children became more aware of positive role models.	___	___	___	___

f. Other (please specify):_____

18. A goal of this program was to encourage a <u>partnership</u> in arts education between the school and the arts agency. To what degree was this goal achieved? (Check one.)

_____ 1. very successful
_____ 2. moderately successful
_____ 3. moderately unsuccessful
_____ 4. not at all successful

19. The best possible way to improve this <u>partnership</u> would be (Check one.)

_____ 1. to have more orientation for teachers prior to the program.
_____ 2. to allow more opportunity for teachers and artists to meet for evaluation on an ongoing basis.
_____ 3. to ask for more teacher input in the planning and implementation of the program earlier than the proposal writing stage.
_____ 4. other (please specify): _____

_____

20. If you wish to recount a "success story", please let us know how a participant benefitted from Arts Partners. (OPTIONAL)

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX F

Synopsis of District Programs with Proposed Evaluation Methods and Final District Documentation

District	Grade	District Objectives	Proposed Evaluation	Evaluation Documentation
A	6-8	-prepare talented students for high school -increase attendance of at-risk students through specially designed workshops	-staff monitoring -performance for parents	-high school admissions test results not available -submitted liaisons assessment of project
B	K	-increase language skills -increase cognitive skills -enhance motor development -increase self-awareness	-staff monitoring	-submitted teacher checklist
C	4-6	-encourage appreciation for cultural heritage -motivate and improve attendance -foster positive self-image -improve social interaction -strengthen communication skills	-student questionnaire/rating sheet	-reported student questionnaire -submitted informal staff interviews
D	Early Childhood	-develop curriculum for thematic approach -encourge positive group interrelationship -engourage positive school approach	-informal meetings between staff -student checklist -formative teacher evaluation	-reported in-house evaluation -reported monthly teacher/liaisons meetings -reported test not administered
	JHS	-increase visual literacy -develop curriculum for thematic approach	-informal staff meetings -informative teacher evaluation	-reported monthly teacher/liaison meetings

APPENDIX F (Continued)

Synopsis of District Programs with Proposed Evaluation Methods and Final District Documentation

District	Grade	District Objectives	Proposed Evaluation	Evaluation Documentation
E	K	-increase in specific spatial relationships -increase in specific quantity concepts -increase self-awareness, self-confidence, motivation, and learning motivation.	-pre + post Boehm test -pupil observation scale -teacher interview scale	-submitted results based on pre + post Boehm test -submitted teacher and student statements
F	6-8	-understanding of vocabulary -increase writing proficiency -increase awareness of cultureal hertiage -teachers will gain knowledge	-district evaluation team will compare pre + post test in writing and vocabulary -arts agency will conduct own -staff questionnaire	-reported pre + post writing test -submitted teacner evaluation survey -submitted informal teacher observation/ evaluation data
G	Elem.	-increase student attendance -awareness of cultural heritage -integration of arts into curriculum	-attitudinal student survey -pre and post program survey -teacher project checklist	-pre + post writing test -submitted district documentation of project
H	3-6	-integration arts into curriculum -improve basic skills -exposure to positive role models -develop innovative curriculum -train teachers.	-student, teacher, administrator -and artist checklists -additional evaluation materials will be developed	-submitted teacher evaluation survey
I	1-3	-improve self-concept -increase thinking skills -edit creative writing -explore and evaluate attitude toward conflict	-arts agency will provide outside evaluator -pre + post Sears-test	-submitted results based on Sears Self-Concept Inventory

APPENDIX F (Continued)

Synopsis of District Programs with Proposed Evaluation Methods and Final District Documentation

District	Grade	District Objectives	Proposed Evaluation	Evaluation Documentation
J	K	-improve student motivation -improve self-image -motivate teachers -expose parents to creativity	-teacher, student and parent questionnaire -on-site teacher training	-submitted several pages of teacher and parent reactions -reported of that teacher questionnaire was conducted -reported that parent questionnaire was not conducted -reported that students questionnaire not available
K	3-6	-integrate arts into the curriculum -experience creative arts	-outside evaluation agency will develop questionnaire -artists keep diaries	-reported that evaluation agency was not approached -submitted letter of observations by participating staff
L	4-8	-improve communication skills -below-level students -increase appreciation for cultural heritage	-pre + post self-esteem tests -ongoing teacher and artist monitoring	-submitted student letters to artists -submitted self esteem pretest results -submitted liaisons assessment of project
M	K-8	-promote awareness of arts resources in district -integration of arts into curriculum -increase appreciation for various ethnic cultures	-assessment of pupil interest -teacher encouragement to engage in future activities	-submitted principal evaluation forms